

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 and 25 are pending in the application. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Office Action states that claim 20 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants have responded by amending the specification.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)**

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Number 6,608,636 issued to Rosen on August 18, 2003.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, claim 24 has been canceled. Applicants' claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"wherein the one or more invitations comprise a photo and a short message service (SMS) message;"

Rosen does not teach this limitation. Applicants agree that Rosen discloses a photo as an invitation. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Rosen does not teach "wherein the one or more invitations comprise a photo and a short message service (SMS) message". This is because Rosen does not disclose the use of SMS messages as the invitation to join the conference call. Furthermore, the communication devices in Rosen are computers, which do not transmit SMS messages. Thus, Rosen is missing the "SMS messages" element, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of Rosen is that the one or more invitations do not comprise a photo and a short message service (SMS) message.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that Rosen does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Rosen. Since claims 2-13 and 21-23 and 25 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Rosen.

Independent claims 14 and 20 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Rosen. For example, claims 14 and 20 recite, "wherein the one or more invitations comprise a photo and a short message service (SMS) message". Rosen does not teach this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 14 and 20 are likewise allowable over Rosen. Since claims 15-19 depend from claim 14, these dependent claims are also allowable over Rosen.

Second, applicants' claim 23 recites,

"wherein the indicator comprises an icon, a tone and a light."

Rosen does not teach this limitation. Applicants agree that Rosen discloses chimes, which the Office Action equates to a tone, and an icon. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Rosen does not teach "wherein the indicator comprises an icon, a tone and a light". This is because Rosen is silent concerning the use of "light" as an indicator. Thus, Rosen is missing the "light" element, as recited in applicants' claim 23.

Third, applicants' claim 25 recites,

"wherein the one or more invitations comprise a phone call, the photo, and the short message service (SMS) message."


Rosen does not teach this limitation. As stated hereinabove, Rosen does not teach SMS messages. Thus, Rosen is missing the "short message service (SMS) message" element, as recited in applicants' claim 25.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: October 16, 2007

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC  
Customer Number 47382